

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-20 have been amended.

The Examiner objected to the specification. To address the Examiner's concerns the specification has been amended to recite "Detailed Description of the Invention." No new matter has been added.

A letter to the Official Draftsman and formal drawings of Figures 1 and 2 accompany this response.

Claims 1-2, 8-12 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO97/25690 (*Olsson*) in view of US Patent No. 5666569 (*Fullam*).

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC section §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Olsson* in view of *Fullam* and in further view of US Patent 4,701,782 (*Duvent*).

Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Olsson* in view of *Fullam* and in further view of US Patent 5,473,368 (*Hart*).

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Olsson* in view of *Fullam* and in further view of US Patent 5,445,155 (*Sieben*).

Claims 7, 14-15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Olsson* in view of *Fullam* and in further view of purported well-known prior art.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable of *Olsson* in view of *Fullam* and *Hart* and in further view of purported well known prior art.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Olsson* in view of *Fullam*, in view of well-known prior art and in further view of *Hart*.

Claim 1 is a method for recording and storing optically detectable data of an image comprising the steps of making a plurality of individual recordings of the object with a single camera at various spatial settings with respect to the relative position between the object and the camera without adjusting the camera settings between the individual recordings; determining the sharply imaged areas of the individual recordings; and assembling the sharply imaged areas of all the individual recordings to form at least one resulting image. *Olsson* does not teach or suggest a method of recording and storing optically detectable data with all the limitations of claim 1. *Olsson* is a method to achieve increased depth of focus and photography that involves multiple shots using different camera settings. See for example, *Olsson* at page 1, lines 36-38; page 2, line 4-6; page 3, lines 27-28 and page 5, lines 43-45. Thus, it does not teach or suggest a method where the camera settings are not adjusted between the individual recordings. The method in *Olsson* utilizes images taken with various depths of focus, perspective turning scale sizing, sensor settings, and lens settings, depth of field. See, e.g.

*Olsson* at pages 2-6. *Olsson* does not teach or suggest a method for recording and storing optically detectable data including all the limitations of claim 1 including making a plurality of individual recordings of the object with a single camera at various spatial settings with respect to the relative position to the camera without adjusting the camera settings between the individual recordings.

One skilled in the art would not combine *Fullam* with *Olsson*. *Olsson* is a method for achieving increased depth of focus in photography. Images taken with different focal distances are used to improve the sharpness by providing different depths of field. One skilled in the art would not combine *Fullam* which uses a fixed focus lens and thus the depth of field cannot change with *Olsson* which utilizes depths of field to create a focused image. (See, e.g. *Olsson* at page 6, paragraph b).

*Fullam* does not make up the deficiencies in *Olsson*. The method of *Olsson* uses images taken using a variety of camera settings including focal distance, tilt, perspective turning, depth of field, etc. *Fullam* does not teach or suggest a substitution for multiple camera settings. *Olsson*, alone or in combination with *Fullam* does not teach or suggest a method with all the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable as are claims 2-20 which depend therefrom.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and thus contains all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, *Olsson* alone or in combination with *Fullam* does not teach or suggest a method for recording and storing optically detectable data with all the limitations of claim 1. *Duvent* does not make up the deficiencies in *Olsson* and/or *Fullam*. *Duvent* is a method for automatically focusing a video pick-up device. It is used when the video camera requires frequent focusing. See for example, *Duvent* at column 1, lines 13-15 and 55-59. *Duvent* is a method for focusing a video pickup device and involves frequently adjusting camera settings. Thus, it teaches away from a method where the camera settings are not adjusted. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable.

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1. Thus, these claims contain all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, *Olsson* alone or in combination with *Fullam* does not teach or suggest a method for recording and storing optically detectable data with all the limitations of claims 4-6. Accordingly, these claims are patentable. Further, *Hart* does not make up the deficiencies in *Olsson* and/or *Fullam*. *Hart* is a security system which automatically focuses the camera and adjusts the focal length based on a location of an intruder. *Hart* teaches away from a method where the camera settings are not adjusted. Accordingly, *Olsson* alone or in combination with *Fullam* and/or *Hart* does not teach a method for recording and storing an optically detectable data with all the limitations of claims 4-6 including making a plurality of individual recordings of

the object with a single camera at various spatial settings with respect to the relative position between the camera without adjusting the camera settings.

Claim 13 depends from claim 1 and thus contains all the limitations of claim 1. For the reasons discussed above *Olsson* alone or in combination with *Fullam* does not teach or suggest a method with all the limitations of claim 13. Further, *Sieben* does not make up the deficiencies in *Olsson*. *Olsson* alone or in combinations with *Sieben* and/or *Fullam* does not teach or suggest a method with all the limitations of claim 13. For example, *Sieben* does not teach or suggest a making a plurality of individual recordings of an object with a single camera at various spatial settings with respect to the relative position between the object and the camera without adjusting the camera settings. Accordingly, claim 13 is patentable.

Claims 7, 14-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Olsson* and/or *Fullam* in view of purported well-known prior art. Claims 7, 9, 14-15, 17 and 19 all depend from claim 1 and thus for the reasons discussed above are patentable.

Claim 16 depends from claim 1 as discussed above, *Olsson* alone or in combination with *Fullam* or *Hart* does not teach or suggest a method for recording and storing optically detectable data with all the limitations of claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 is patentable.

Claim 18 depends from claim 1 and thus includes all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, *Olsson* alone or in combination with *Fullam* and/or *Hart* does not teach or suggest a method for recording and storing optically detectable data with all the limitations of claim 18. Accordingly, claim 18 is patentable.

Applicant asserts that all of the objections have been obviated and, therefore now respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections, and allowance of the application.